

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

ARMANDO SERRANO,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	No. 17 CV 2869
)	
-vs-)	
)	The Honorable Manish S. Shah
)	
REYNALDO GUEVARA, et al.)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

JOSE MONTANEZ,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
-vs-)	No. 17 CV 4560
)	
)	
REYNALDO GUEVARA, et al.)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

**PLAINTIFFS SERRANO AND MONTANEZ’S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS’
MOTION FOR REASSIGNMENT**

NOW COMES, Plaintiffs JOSE MONTANEZ and ARMANDO SERRANO respectfully file this response to the defendants’ motion for reassignment.

1. Plaintiffs Serrano and Montanez have considered this Court's comments regarding the Defendants' pending Motion for Reassignment Based on Relatedness, Dckt. No. 43.

2. In light of the fact that Defendants are seeking to reassign and consolidate the Montanez case solely for all pre-trial proceedings, and not yet for trial, Plaintiffs do not oppose Defendants’ Motion. Plaintiffs submit that after Rule 56 motions have been ruled upon, this

Court will be in the best position to determine if the two cases should also be consolidated for trial.

3. Plaintiffs are also in accord with adopting Mr. Montanez's case number for purposes of utilizing the Northern District of Illinois's Mandatory Initial Discovery Pilot Project, and for referring this matter to the Magistrate Judge as necessary.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs Serrano and Montanez respectfully request that this Court grant Defendants' Motion for Reassignment, Dckt. No. 43, consolidate the cases for all pre-trial proceedings, and defer deciding whether to consolidate the cases for trial until all Rule 56 motions have been resolved.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/JENNIFER BONJEAN

/s/RUSSELL AINSWORTH

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, JENNIFER BONJEAN, an attorney certifies that I electronically served a copy of Plaintiff's Response to the Defendants' Motion for Reassignment upon all counsel of record on August 18, 2017 by filing it via the CM/ECF case management system.

/s/JENNIFER BONJEAN